

Statement of Richard J. Doubrava
Managing Director - Security
Air Transport Association of America
Hearing Before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee on Aviation Security
April 6, 2000

Madam Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Richard J. Doubrava, Managing Director of Security for the Air Transport Association of America. ATA represents the major commercial passenger and cargo air carriers in the United States. On behalf of our twenty-eight member airlines, I would like to thank you and the other members of the subcommittee for the opportunity to participate in this oversight hearing.

The safety and security of our passengers is our industry's number one priority. Substantial progress has been made since the 1996 report by the Presidential Commission on Aviation Safety and Security and enactment by Congress of legislation which set out the priorities for a joint industry and government partnership to improve the aviation security baseline. We believe that this partnership over the past four years has resulted in a more secure environment for the traveling public, but we still confront significant challenges.

As we look back on these recommendations and legislative initiatives it is useful to measure the progress which we have made. As part of the industry's commitment to these efforts in 1996, ATA's CEO Carol Hallett presented a far reaching security plan committing our members to a number of important goals including wide-scale deployment of detection technology; implementation of automated passenger profiling; and establishment of security screening

ATA's members are Airborne Express, Alaska Airlines, Aloha Airlines, America West Airlines, American Airlines, American Trans Air, Atlas Air, Continental Airlines, Delta Air Lines, DHL Airways, Emery Worldwide, Evergreen International, Federal Express, Hawaiian Airlines, Midwest Express, Northwest Airlines, Polar Air Cargo, Reeve Aleutian Airlines, Southwest Airlines, Trans World Airlines, United Airlines, United Parcel Service, and US Airways. ATA's associate members are Aeromexico, Air Canada, Canadian Airlines International, KLM--Royal Dutch Airlines, and Mexicana Airlines.

contractor certification requirements.

The industry has strongly supported these efforts throughout the legislative and regulatory process necessary to achieve these goals.

The subject of today's hearing by the Aviation Subcommittee is most timely given the evolution occurring in the airport environment of the security checkpoint with relation to equipment, training and performance issues as well as the pending process by the FAA to certify security screening companies.

Over the past thirty years the aviation security system has evolved significantly. Checkpoint security was originally established in the early 1970's to deter would-be hijackers. Since such threats required deterrents to keep such individuals off aircraft, air carriers became the front line defense in preventing air piracy. Since that time air carriers have been assigned by the government the primary responsibility for providing checkpoint security. Working with the FAA and the airports, we believe that these efforts have been pursued with commitment and dedication in an environment which has changed substantially as the threat of terrorism and violent acts on civil aviation have increased.

The industry, working with the FAA, has undertaken a number of major initiatives during this period. In 1989, ATA and the Regional Airline Association (RAA) jointly developed the first written FAA-approved screener training program aimed at improving screener knowledge and performance. The program consists of comprehensive screener and supervisor training materials which are made available to air carriers and screening companies which clearly define the role and responsibilities of the checkpoint and checkpoint personnel. This information has been updated as necessary. ATA just completed a major enhancement in our program by developing a computer-based training (CBT) product for field use.

In 1990, ATA expanded its training product to implement a "train-the trainer" program which

provides checkpoint supervisory personnel with the necessary knowledge and technique to conduct local training programs thus expanding training opportunities.

In 1993, ATA and the RAA developed a “Checkpoint Operations Guide” (COG) which provided all domestic security checkpoints with a comprehensive operating manual setting out the technical and administrative guidance for passenger screening personnel. The information in this guide is a synopsis of standards and statutory requirements jointly established by the FAA and industry associations. This is updated as required and has brought consistency and clarity to the checkpoint screening environment.

All of these efforts were guided by the commitment of both the industry and the government to improve checkpoint performance and screener proficiency in an ever-changing security environment. During the same time security threats grew dramatically. Additional security measures were required to be conducted due to valid domestic and international security concerns. The weapons of threat have become more sophisticated and more difficult to detect. The challenges at the checkpoint have greatly multiplied.

Clearly once the pending regulation is final, there will be a major sea change in the screening checkpoint environment. The FAA screener certification process will make security screening companies a full partner in the checkpoint process.

While supportive, the industry has concerns and questions in a number of areas with the FAA’s proposed rule. These include issues of clearly defining accountability as well as the regulatory structure devised to support this process. It is important that the FAA not create a bureaucratic structure that becomes over-burdensome to the industry.

ATA is also concerned about the ultimate regulatory and economic impact the proposed certification process may inflict on some aspects of the security screening industry possibly

affecting their continued ability to compete in a new regulatory environment. A number of companies providing such services are local business entities located in small airport environments and unfamiliar with federal regulatory processes. They may find it difficult or economically unfeasible to continue such services. This includes a number of our regional airline partners which serve small airports without benefit of X-ray checkpoint equipment where employees of the air carriers conduct personal screening.

We commend the FAA for holding field meetings this week in Ft. Worth and San Francisco to foster greater participation by screening companies and further discussion on the proposed certification rule. Ultimately, we are confident that these issues will be resolved and a final rule enacted which meets our common goal of enhancing the security screening baseline.

In tandem with these efforts, we believe that the continued development and deployment of enhanced checkpoint screening technology (TRX) will further contribute to this improvement. We were pleased when the FAA agreed to support the industry recommendation to implement a multi-year plan to replace current checkpoint x-ray technology with new, state of the art detection which includes threat-image projection (TIP) and operator-assist functions. A number of security equipment vendors are participating in the FAA selection process. They have worked closely with the FAA and the industry in developing technology that improves detection and also addresses the carrier's reliability and customer service needs.

With initial deployment set to begin at our nation's largest airports within the next several months, it is vital that this replacement plan be fully funded on a multi-year basis by the FAA until all airports obtain such updated checkpoint equipment. The deployment of this technology alone will result in improved screening and screener performance at all checkpoints.

The industry continues to be keenly interested in further exploring the human factors and associated responses at play in the checkpoint operation. This includes the vital role of

motivating employees in the stressful environment of an airport checkpoint operation. We look forward to obtaining some reporting data and trend information from current FAA studies underway at a number of checkpoint screening locations to attempt to determine any relationship between screener ability, performance, compensation and workplace environment. This is an area where there is little in the way of definitive data and this information should serve as a preliminary review for issues which will no doubt need further study and consideration.

In late 1996, the Congress, the FAA and the industry committed to the prompt development and deployment of a computer-assisted passenger screening program (CAPS). We met that goal with the implementation by the industry of such a program in December 1998. Here the industry and the FAA worked closely in overcoming many difficult operational and technical issues to successfully achieve this goal. CAPS is extremely useful as the result of its adaptability and its invisibility. Quick modification of screening criteria in the computer program can respond immediately to any evolving security threats, while the necessary associated screening measures are deployed behind the scenes.

Based on the current level of threat in the United States and the high volume of passenger traffic, CAPS has offered an efficient, non-invasive security procedure meeting the needs of the FAA security program and lessening its intrusiveness on the traveling public. We urge expansion of this program for use by U.S. air carriers in their international operations and commend the FAA for its ongoing efforts with the industry to test and further develop "I-CAPS" at several foreign locations. There is great potential for reducing the invasive physical screening of persons and baggage currently necessary for international "selectee" passengers.

The area of greatest challenge is the ongoing effort to deploy explosive detection systems (EDS) and other new security technologies associated with checked baggage screening. This deployment has been handled by the Security Integrated Product Team ("IPT") made up of the FAA and industry representatives working with a coalition of manufacturers, contractors,

vendors and associations. Clearly the scope and complexity of such a massive deployment is prone to a variety of issues which complicate the process. The installation of this equipment into very different airline check-in and baggage make-up areas as well as the huge diversity between airline operations and individual airport locations compounds these complexities even further. Given that we are working, for the most part, with first generation technology, the industry continues to experience significant issues with operating procedures, alarm rates and resolution, performance, staffing, training, testing and maintenance costs.

It is vital to the overall success of these ongoing efforts that the following occur:

- We must have a full commitment by the Congress and the FAA to continue support and multi-year funding for programs which are an extension of our national security;
- The FAA must aggressively seek, foster and fund research and development of new and competing technologies. Streamlined certification methods should be adopted to encourage more efficient, faster and more cost-effective baggage screening technology;
- And, the industry must continue to partner with the FAA in an open and constructive manner to jointly develop a strategic approach to these issues which will ensure overall success of these efforts.

As I noted earlier, progress over the past four years has been exceptionally good. ATA and our member carriers are grateful for the continued support of the Chairman, this committee and the Congress in providing the on-going commitment and funding to achieve the goals which the industry and the government jointly developed in 1996. We remain dedicated to working in partnership with the Congress and the Federal Aviation Administration in all areas of aviation

security.

Thank you again for providing ATA the opportunity to participate in this hearing. I would be pleased to respond to any questions the committee might have.